



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,582	01/16/2002	Victoria M. Bellotti	D/A1490Q	4948

7590 01/22/2007
Patent Documentation Center
Xerox Corporation
100 Clinton Ave. S., Xerox Square 20th Floor
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER	
BLAIR, DOUGLAS B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/046,582	BELLOTTI ET AL.	
	Examiner Douglas B. Blair	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 3-8 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 3-8 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/27/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 3-8 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 12/29/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 3-8 under the previous grounds of rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,917,965 to Gupta.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 4 refers to the method of claim 3 but claim 3 is actually a system claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following rejection was also made in related application 10/046,581.
6. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention. Claims 1 and 26 are vague and indefinite because it is unclear of the term "thrask". The examiner is confused of the definition of a thrask. Applicant defined it as "it is like a Microsoft Outlook.TM. thread. However, a thrask is less easy to capture technically, because it does allow for an element of human judgement". It is unclear what is the element of a human judgment. Applicant further defines it as "A thrask may or may not have a single deadline, and may or may not include items representing multiple tasks."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent

Number 6,917,965 to Gupta et al.

9. As to claim 3, Gupta teaches a system for managing and tracking information items within a first message-based system, the first message-based system being one of a set of message-based systems within a workgroup, the first message-based system having a viewer, the system comprising: (a) a thrask generating module generating a plurality of thrasks (col. 3, lines 1-8), each of the thrasks including at least one information item having a set of metadata, the metadata including at least one of the group of a deadline, a reminder, a deferral and an obligation (col. 8, lines 18-31 and 46-54); (b) a sorting module sorting a new information item

into one of the thrasks in accordance with at least one criterion (col. 9, lines 11-24); (c) a display module displaying one or more of the thrasks and at least one of the metadata of each of the information items in each of the displayed thrasks in the viewer (col. 11, lines 1-4); and an updating module updating the thrasks and at least one metadata (col. 10, lines 16-18).

10. As to claim 4, Gupta teaches the system of claim 3 wherein the first message-based system has different capabilities than some in the set of message-based systems (the Gupta invention has different capabilities than a regular email system).

11. As to claim 5, Gupta teaches a method for managing and tracking information items within a first message-based system, the first message-based system being one of a set of message-based system within a shared workgroup, the message-based systems being synchronized periodically with a shared workgroup component on a server, the first message-based system having a viewer, the method comprising the operations of: (a) generating a plurality of thrasks (col. 3, lines 1-8), each of the thrasks including at least one information items having a set of metadata (col. 7, line 62-col. 10, line 5, this section defines the set of metadata); (b) sorting a new information items into one of the thrasks in accordance with at least one criterion (col. 9, lines 11-24); (c) displaying one or more of the thrasks and at least one of the metadata of one of the information items in one of the displayed thrasks in the viewer (col. 11, lines 1-4); and (d) providing a shared view of some of the thrasks to a subset of the message-based systems within the shared workgroup in response to a user selection of an option (col. 12, lines 11-23).

12. As to claim 6, Gupta teaches the method of claim 5 further comprising the operation of:

(e) updating at least one of the metadata of one of the information items in one of the thrasks (col. 10, lines 16-18).

13. As to claim 7, Gupta teaches a system for managing and tracking information items within a first message-based system, the first message-based system being one of a set of message-based systems within a shared workgroup, the message-based systems being synchronized periodically with a shared workgroup component on a server, the first message-based system having a viewer, the system comprising: (a) a thrask generating module generating a plurality of thrasks (col. 3, lines 1-8), each of the thrasks including at least one information item having a set of metadata (col. 7, line 62-col. 10, line 5, this section defines the set of metadata); (b) a sorting module sorting a new information items into one of the thrasks in accordance with at least one criterion (col. 9, lines 11-24); (c) a display module displaying one or more, of the thrasks and at least one of the metadata of one of the information items in one of the displayed thrasks in the viewer (col. 11, lines 1-4); and (d) a sharing module providing a shared view of some of the thrasks to a subset of the message-based systems within the shared workgroup in response to a user selection of an option (col. 12, lines 11-23).

14. As to claim 8, Gupta teaches the system of claim 7 further comprising: (e) an updating module updating at least one of the metadata of one of the information items in on of the thrasks (col. 10, lines 16-18).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2142

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is (571) 272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Douglas Blair



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER